10/19/67

Dear Harold,

My thanks for your letter of 10/15/67 and please forgive me for not typing this but my fingers are rebelling after reams of draft reports on the General Assembly.

I had expected a copy of my book on 10/25 or 10/27 Imagine my amazement when a messenger delivered it on 10/17/67, a week or more ahead of Schedule! I am pleased with the jacket and general design of the book. As yet I have but one single copy but I hope to speed one to you next week, when a supply arrives. And I sincerely hope that the book will not disappoint you seriously — although I feel it inevitable that you and my other colleagues will find some flaws and errors — inadvertent, I assure you. At the pace we have all been working, it is perhaps unavoidable, but, as I said, inadvertent — as was my use of your name as one of Sir Gerwick, already retracted. I thought you had been among those who told me he was Chief Investigator — Frankly, there was no reason (before his defection) to make any record or tally. I had to rely on recollection and I completely accept your statement (and Bethell's) that I was mistaken. I can only reiterate that it was in good faith.

I agree that there is a difference between destroying an original and a copy. But that is not what Garrison said. He said the document was destroyed, with the clear implication that it was destroyed in the same way that Hunes' destroyed his "notes."

over

I am at the office so I cannot check the reference CE 948, but I am not certain that one can conclude from its contents that it was the original that was destroyed by thermo fax. I will try to check that tonight. [later: It says "the copy in Oswald's passport file" which does not rule out the possibility that it was the original but does not provide grounds for saying it was. The point remains that Garrison did not shrink from quoting out of context so as to mislead the public. You are defending an argument he never made.]

Harold, you are quite right: I am "emotional" about Garrison, in the same way that I am about the WR, and as you are yourself unapologetically emotional on the WR. But that has not diminished your scholarship, your sense of responsibility and readiness to document in meticulous detail your assertions, or your ability to employ logic in evaluating facts and adducing cause-and-effect. So, clearly, emotionality in itself (as you argued in a conversation we once had, in which you decried the clinical, unemotional side of the "intellectual(s)") is not sinful. It becomes dangerous only when it affects judgment or produces a manipulation of fact or truth for some ultimate "good" purpose. You may think my bias against Garrison is affecting my judgment, but I think the critics who defend him are affected by their bias for him. And I remind you that from January to April (or was it May?) I was 100% pro-Garrison and did everything in my power to assist him when I could — I didn't even wait to be asked. I found that I had been mistaken and it was a painful discovery. We will see, in the end, who is right. Best always.

Sylvia